



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

|   |             |                      |                     |                  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/785,352  | 02/24/2004  | Harsha S. Nagesh     | 10-26-12-10-40      | 8735             |
| 7590  |             | 04/10/2008           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP<br>90 Forest Avenue<br>Locust Valley, NY 11560 |             |                      | DUONG, FRANK        |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2616                |                  |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|   |             |                      | 04/10/2008          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

|                        |                     |  |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
| 10/785,352             | NAGESH ET AL.       |  |
| <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
| Frank Duong            | 2616                |  |

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED **18 March 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Frank Duong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment dated 03/18/08 encounters the following errors. First, the current identifiers of base claims 1, 16 and 19 are "Previously presented." These identifier are incorrected. The last limitation in the claims has been amended from "routes" to "transmits." Second, such amendment should be identified with "currently amended" and the amended term should be underlined. In addition, such amendment would change the scope of the claimed invention originally claimed and previously prosecuted. As a result, it raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Pertaining the arguments, they have been noted. Specifically, on page 7 of the Remarks, Applicants argue "Shenoy fails to teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1 directed to distributing parts of a split traffic flow to respective ones of the plurality of participating nodes wherein at least a first one of the participating nodes receiving one of the parts of a traffic flow transmits at least a portion of its received part to at least a second one of the participating nodes receiving another one of the parts of the traffic flow." This argument appears to direct to the newly added limitation discussed above. Moreover, even though Shenoy's edge router transmits all received datagrams to switch 140B, the teaching of plurality can and is interpreted to read on singularity. Applicants are reminded that the USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023,1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed. Perhaps, in a response to this Office Action, Applicant should further amend to incorporate the idea of a load-balanced architecture for dynamic traffic in a mesh network to load balance across the network regardless of the switching architecure employed in each node to better reflect the disclosed invention as well as better distinguish the claimed invention from that taught by the applied arts and any load-balanced switches. Due to the response fails to place the instant application in a favorable condition for allowance, the proposed amendment is not entered and the rejection is maintained .